

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 3-7 are pending in this application, Claims 1, 3, and 7 having been presently amended. Support for amended Claims 1, 3, and 7 can be found, for example, in the original claims, drawings, and specification as originally filed.¹ No new matter has been added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Mizutani et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,817,710; hereinafter "Mizutani I"); and Claims 3-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Mizutani I in view of Mizutani et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,761,677; hereinafter "Mizutani II").

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the courtesy of Examiner Kunemund in granting an interview in this case with Applicants' representative on August 6, 2008. During the interview, amendments to Claims 1 and 7 (same as those contained in this Amendment) were discussed. The Examiner agreed that the amendments overcome the cited reference.

In response to the rejection of Claims 1 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Mizutani I, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent Claims 1 and 7 recite features clearly not disclosed or rendered obvious by the applied reference.

Amended independent Claim 1 is directed to a single-crystal growth apparatus including, *inter alia*:

... the single-crystal growth apparatus the interfocal distance of the one and other foci is 41.4 – 67.0 mm and the minor axis / major axis ratio of the spheroid mirrors is 0.90 – 0.95, and the major axes of the spheroid mirrors are set to 57.7 – 80 mm, the minor axes to 52 – 76 mm, and the total power of

¹ See page 10, lines 20-22 of the specification.

each of the heat sources is 650 W, for a heating performance of 2,000 °C.

As discussed during the interview, Mizutani I only describes that when using a halogen lamp of 1.5kW, a polycrystalline rod of Ni-Zn ferrite is heated to 1,650 °C.² Mizutani I does not describe reaching heating performance of 2,000 °C using heat sources each having a total power of 650 W, as in Applicants' Claims 1 and 7.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1 and 7 patentably distinguish over Mizutani I, and respectfully request the rejection of Claims 1 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Mizutani be withdrawn.

In response to the rejection of Claims 3-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Mizutani I in view of Mizutani II, Applicants note that Claims 3-6 are dependent on Claim 1 and are believed to be patentable for at least the reasons discussed above. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that Mizutani II fails to cure any of the above noted deficiencies of Mizutani I.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejection of Claims 3-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Mizutani I in view of Mizutani II be withdrawn.

² See Mizutani I at column 6, lines 55-64.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, and in light of the above discussion, the pending claims as presented herewith are believed to be in condition for formal allowance, and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413-2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Derek P. Benke
Registration No. 56,944